UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,324	03/29/2001	Christine S. Pepin	05026.00002	3124

			EXAMINER
22907	7590	05/07/2004	WU, YICUN

BANNER & WITCOFF
1001 G STREET N W
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	9

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/820,324		PEPIN ET AL.	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		Yicun Wu		2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 March 2004*.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

III. DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-35 are presented for examination.

2. Applicant's arguments submitted on 3-11-2004 with respect to claims 1-35 have been reconsidered but are not deemed persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

Response to Applicant' Remarks

3. Examiner has completed a through study of Applicant's amendment of March 11, 2004.

4. Especially, Applicant's amendments to claims 1-35 and remarks at pages 9-10 of the Amendment of 3-11-2004 has been carefully studied and reviewed.

5. Applicant's amendments to claims 1-35 further direct the claimed invention into a method for processing information.

6. Examiner has carefully and thoroughly studied and reviewed Applicant's amendment of 3-11-2004. Examiner asserts that Morgenstern in combination with Shaner teaches Applicant's claimed invention of a method for processing information.

In addition, the specially discussed feature of the claimed invention ("unknown data") is very clearly discussed in <u>Shaner</u> (col. 4, lines 10-25).

7. Applicant is inaccurate for the reasons explicitly stated in the first Office Action. Examiner asserts that <u>Morgenstern</u> in combination with <u>Shaner</u> teaches Applicant's claimed invention of a method for processing information.

8. These reasons have been explicitly stated in the first Office Action. Please see the next section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Morgenstern</u> (U. S. Patent No. 5,970,490), in view of <u>Shaner</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,714).

As to claims 1, 22-23, and 34, Morgenstern teaches a method

for processing information comprising the steps of:

selecting a first label object (i.e. data schema

specification) from a first list of label objects to identify a

first set of data (Fig. 2-4);

selecting a second label from a second list of label

objects to identify a second set of data (Fig. 2-4);

applying a first rule associated with the first set of data

based on the selection of the first label object (Fig. 2-4); and

applying a second rule associated with the second set of

data based on the selection of the second label object (Fig. 2-

4).

Morgenstern does not teach: unknown data.

Shaner teaches unknown data (Shaner col. 4, lines 10-25)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

have modified Morgenstern to include unknown data.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified Morgenstern by the teaching of Shaner to include

unknown data, because to automatically process electronic data

properly, a truly automated data processing system must be able

to identify the type of data contained in a received electronic file as taught by <u>Shaner</u> (<u>Shaner</u> column 1, lines 10-19).

As to claims 2 and 24, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method wherein at least one of the first set of data and the second set of data is a column (a column is well known in the art).

As to claims 3 and 25, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method wherein at least one of the first set of data and the second set of data is a field (a field is well known in the art).

As to claim 4, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method wherein at least one of the first rule and the second rule is applied to the content of a cell in a column based on the content of the cell.

As to claim 5, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method wherein at least one of the first rule and the second rule is applied to the content of a first cell in a column based on the content of a second cell (i.e. semantic transformation rules) (Fig. 2, item 20).

As to claims 6 and 26, Morgenstern discloses a method further comprising the step of:

applying a third rule to the first set of data based on the selection of the first label (Fig. 2).

As to claims 7 and 27, Morgenstern discloses a method further comprising the step of:

after the selecting a first label object step, removing the first label object from the first list of label objects to result in the second list of label objects (Fig. 2, item 20).

As to claims 8 and 28, Morgenstern discloses a method wherein the first list of label objects is identical to the second list of label objects (Fig. 2, item 20 and 24).

As to claims 9 and 29, Morgenstern discloses a method comprising the step of:

outputting the result of the first and second applying steps to a remote application.

As to claims 10 and 30, Morgenstern discloses a method wherein the first applying step comprises the step of:

generating a third set of data based on the first set of
data (Fig. 2).

As to claims 11 and 31, Morgenstern discloses a method
wherein the first applying step comprises the step of:

replacing the first set of data with a third set of data
(Fig. 2, item 20).

As to claims 12 and 32, Morgenstern discloses a method
wherein:

the first rule performs the step of data scrubbing on the
information (Fig. 2, item 20) and (col. 11, lines 36-38).

As to claim 13, Morgenstern discloses a method, wherein the
first rule filters the information (Fig. 2) and (col. 15, lines
32-35).

As to claim 14, Morgenstern discloses a method, wherein the
first rule applies source rules to the information (Fig. 2).

As to claims 15, Morgenstern discloses a method, wherein
the first rule applies destination rules to the information
(Fig. 2).

As to claim 16, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method, wherein the first rule applies cleanup rules to the information (Fig. 2).

As to claim 17, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method wherein the first rule applies derivation rules to the information (col. 23, lines 41-44).

As to claim 18, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method wherein the first rule applies transformation rules to the information (Fig. 2).

As to claim 19, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method wherein the first rule applies mapping rules to the information (Fig. 2 and col. 24, lines 41-49).

As to claim 20, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method, wherein the first applying step comprising the steps of:

determining at least one of a supplier of the information and a recipient of the information (Fig. 2);

determining to apply the first rule from a set of rules based on at least one of the supplier and the recipient; and

applying the first rule (Fig. 2).

As to claims 21, 33 and 35, <u>Morgenstern</u> discloses a method further comprising the steps of:

determining at least one a header row (i.e. "header") of the information, a supplier of the information and a recipient information (col. 9, lines 33-43);

storing the first and second selecting steps with at least one of an indication of the header row, the supplier, and the recipient as part of a knowledgebase (col. 9, lines 33-43); and

when processing new information with an indication, matching at least one of the header row, the supplier and the recipient, performing the first and second selecting steps on the new information (col. 9, lines 33-43).

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**, Applicant's amendment

necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

office action. Accordingly, *THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP*

706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy

as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as

set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory- period for reply to this final

action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of

this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH

shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) will be calculated

from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply-expire later than

SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Points of contact

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yicun Wu whose telephone number is 703-305-4889. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, Monday -Friday.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Yicun Wu
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

DIANE D. MIZRAHI
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

April 26, 2004